

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed May 15, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 31, 2003, May 5, 2004, June 28, 2004, and September 13, 2004. A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 1-4 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new claims 17-27 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicants are entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 17-27 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 4 and 17-21 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 1-3 as anticipated by JP 2001-217443 to Yamauchi. The Applicants respectfully submit that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a support including a magnetic sheet; an adhesive material adjacent to the support including the magnetic sheet; an insulating film adjacent to the adhesive material; and a thin film transistor adjacent to the insulating film. The features of amended claim 1 are supported in the specification, for example, by Embodiment 1, especially by page 19, lines 11-20 (an insulating film),

page 19, lines 24-30 (a thin film transistor), and page 22, lines 10-18 (an adhesive material and a support including magnetic sheet); and by Figure 5L. Further, dependent claims 2 and 3 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention.

Yamauchi appears to disclose an invar alloy substrate, an adhesive layer over the invar alloy substrate, and a silicon layer over the substrate. However, Yamauchi does not disclose an insulating film over the invar alloy substrate. In addition, Yamauchi does not disclose a thin film transistor. Therefore, Yamauchi does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Yamauchi does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained.

The Official Action rejects claim 4 as anticipated by JP 2001-051296 to Utsunomiya. The Applicants respectfully submit that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

Independent claim 4 has been amended to recite a support which is an adhesive material; a protective film over the support; an insulating film over the protective film; and a middle processing component comprising a control section and an operation section, and a memory unit over the insulating film, where the middle processing component includes a thin film transistor of n-channel type and a thin film transistor of p-channel type. The features of amended claim 4 are supported in the specification, for example, by Embodiment 7, especially by page 36, line 27, to page 37, line 9 (a middle processing component, an insulating film); by Embodiment Mode 2, especially by page 13, line 1, to page 14, line 1 (a protective film, a support which is an adhesive material); and by Figures 2C and 11E.

The Official Action asserts that "Utsunomiya discloses on figure 21 a semiconductor device comprising a support 100 which is a binding material" (page 3, Paper No. 20050303). However, Utsunomiya does not teach that the support 100 is a binding material or an adhesive material. As noted above, independent claim 4, as

amended, recites a support which is an adhesive material. Utsunomiya does not teach a support which is an adhesive material, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Utsunomiya does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claim 5 as it depends from claim 4 as obvious based on the combination of Utsunomiya and U.S. Patent No. 6,313,481 to Ohtani et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Please incorporate the arguments above with respect to the deficiencies in Utsunomiya. Ohtani does not cure the deficiencies in Utsunomiya. The Official Action


relies on Ohtani to allegedly teach a video camera. However, Utsunomiya and Ohtani, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a support which is an adhesive material. Since Utsunomiya and Ohtani do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

It appears that the Official Action has not formally rejected claim 5 as it depends from claim 1 or 2; therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

New claims 17-27 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicants are entitled. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 17-27 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789